



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/305,240	05/04/1999	BYUNG-SUP SHIM	5484-48	1838
7590 10/07/2003 MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM P C 1030 S W MORRISON STREET PORTLAND, OR 97205			EXAMINER NADAV, ORI	
			ART UNIT 2811	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/305,240

Applicant(s)

SHIM ET AL.

Examiner

ori nadav

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 and 9-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 14 recites an impurity implantation region having a top surface and a bottom surface, wherein the top surface is larger than the bottom surface. The top surface of the impurity implantation region is the surface that is in contact with the gate oxide. In consideration of the top surface, the bottom surface of the impurity implantation region is the entire angled lower portion of the impurity implantation. There is no description in the disclosure for a top surface of the impurity implantation region being larger than the entire angled lower portion of the impurity implantation. Therefore, there is no support for an impurity implantation region having a top surface is larger than the bottom surface, as claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2811

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
2. The claimed limitation of a first sector having a narrower line width than a line width of the gate, as recited in claims 6, 11 and 15, is unclear as to what is meant by a line of a first sector and a line of the gate

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 5-7 and 9-17, insofar as in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramanian et al. (5,668,021) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Regarding claim 5, Subramanian et al. teach in figure 7 and related text a transistor comprising: a semiconductor substrate 10 of a first conductivity type; source and drain regions 28, 30, 34, 36 of a second conductivity type formed in the substrate and defining between them a channel region, an impurity

Art Unit: 2811

implantation region 24 of impurities of a second conductivity type (column 3, lines 56-58) formed in a first sector of the channel region, the first sector (i.e. the region where the impurity implantation region 24 is located) separated from the source region and the drain region 28, 30, 34, 36, the impurity implantation region comprising a depletion channel of the second conductivity type completely occupying a first surface region of the semiconductor substrate, wherein a lateral extent of the first surface region is equal to a lateral extent of the impurity implantation region, a second sector of the channel region exclusive of the first sector comprising an enhancement channel of the first conductivity type with uniform doping concentration and occupying a second surface region of the semiconductor substrate, a gate insulating layer 12 on the substrate over at least a portion of the first surface region and the second surface region, and a gate 46 (14, 26 and 38, see column 5, lines 57-60) on the gate insulating layer over at least a portion of the first sector and over at least a portion of the second sector. Although Subramanian et al. do not state that the second sector of the channel region comprises a uniform doping concentration, the embodiment of figure 7 does not recite any additional channel doping in the second sector (the second sector is a region in the channel region which is exclusive of the first sector) and no special substrate doping. Note that the second sector of the channel region is part of the substrate. Thus, the doping concentration of the substrate 10 is uniform, as claimed.

Art Unit: 2811

Subramanian et al. do not teach using the transistor as a pull up transistor, wherein one of the source and drain regions being electrically coupled to an I/O pad and the other one being electrically coupled to a Vdd terminal, and does not state that the impurity implantation region of the first sector is operable as a depletion channel, and the second sector of the channel region is operable as an enhancement channel.

AAPA teaches in figure 1 and related text (page 2, lines 1-15) a pull up transistor B, wherein one of the source and drain regions being electrically coupled to an I/O pad 20 and the other one being electrically coupled to a Vdd terminal.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Subramanian et al.'s transistor as a pull up transistor, wherein one of the source and drain regions being electrically coupled to an I/O pad and the other one being electrically coupled to a Vdd terminal, as taught by AAPA, in order to use the device in an application which requires a pull up transistor. Note that in order to operate a pull up transistor one of the source and drain regions must be electrically coupled to an I/O pad and the other one must electrically coupled to a Vdd terminal. The combination is motivated by the teachings of AAPA who point out the need for an improved pull up transistor.

Furthermore, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459

Art Unit: 2811

(CCPA 1963). In this case, Subramanian's transistor is capable of performing as a pull up transistor.

Regarding the claimed limitations of an impurity implantation region of the first sector being operable under field effect as a depletion channel, and the second sector of the channel region being operable under field effect as an enhancement channel, although Subramanian et al. and AAPA do not state that the impurity implantation region of the first sector is operable under field effect as a depletion channel, and the second sector of the channel region is operable under field effect as an enhancement channel, these features are inherent in Subramanian et al. and AAPA's device for the following reasons. The first sector comprises first conductive type dopants and the second sector comprises second conductive type dopants. The equivalent circuit for Subramanian et al. and AAPA's transistor is identical to the equivalent circuit for applicant's transistor depicted in applicant's figure 7c. The equivalent circuit comprises three transistors operating at two different modes, a first sector operates at an n-channel (Subramanian et al., column 3, lines 59-61) as a depletion transistor, and a second sector operates at a p-channel as an enhancement transistor. Therefore, while operating the transistor as a pull up transistor, the impurity implantation region of the first sector of Subramanian et al. and AAPA's transistor is operable under field effect as a depletion channel (due to the first conductive type dopants), and the second sector of the channel region is operable under

Art Unit: 2811

field effect as an enhancement channel (due to the second conductive type dopants), as claimed.

In the alternative, regarding the claimed limitations of an impurity implantation region of the first sector being as a depletion channel, and the second sector of the channel region being as an enhancement channel, claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Danley, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "Apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." (emphasis in original) Hewlett - Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990). A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). In this case, the claimed structure is not distinct from prior art's structure, because Subramanian et al. and AAPA's transistor is identical to applicant's transistor.

Regarding claim 10, Subramanian et al. teach an impurity implantation region having a lateral extent coextensive with the first sector, and occupying the entire top surface of the semiconductor substrate within the first sector.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 14, Subramanian et al. teach an impurity implantation region having a top surface and a bottom surface. The top surface is larger than the bottom surface, because the top surface can be defined as the surface that is in contact with the gate oxide, whereas the bottom surface can be defined as the lowest point in the bottom of the impurity implantation region.

Regarding claims 6, 11 and 15, Subramanian et al. teach in figure 7 and related text a first sector 24 having a narrower line width than a line width of the gate 46 (14, 26 and 38, see column 5, lines 57-60).

Regarding claims 7, 12 and 16, Subramanian et al. teach in figure 7 and related text a gate 46 (14, 26 and 38, see column 5, lines 57-60) comprises a first portion over the first sector and a second portion over the second sector; and the first portion is in a predetermined ratio with respect to the second portion.

Regarding claims 9, 13 and 17, Subramanian et al. teach in figure 7 and related text a first sector separated from the source region and from the drain region by substantially equal distances (column 2, lines 45-47).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant argues on page 7 that in figure 5a and on page 5, lines 4-8 the phrase "line width" refers to the lateral extent of the structure.

Art Unit: 2811

The examiner could not find a recitation of the phrase “line width” in figure 5a and on page 5, lines 4-8.

5. Applicant argues that the examiner suggested an amendment which would distinguish applicant’s region 74 from the “egg shaped” region 24 of Subramanian et al.

The examiner agrees that region 74 of the claimed invention is not an “egg shaped” region, and can be distinguished from the “egg shaped” region 24 of Subramanian et al. A recitation of an impurity implantation region having a top surface and a bottom surface, wherein the top surface is larger than the bottom surface, does not necessarily distinguish region 74 of the claimed invention from the “egg shaped” region 24 of Subramanian et al. (see discussion above). A recitation such as an impurity implantation region having a topmost or substantially flat top surface and a bottommost surface, wherein the topmost or substantially flat top surface is larger than the bottommost surface, will distinguish region 74 of the claimed invention from the “egg shaped” region 24 of Subramanian et al.

6. Applicant argues on page 8 that Subramanian et al. and APA do not teach that the lateral extent of the first surface region is equal to a lateral extent of the impurity implantation region and that the impurity implantation region and the first sector have the same lateral extent.

Art Unit: 2811

Subramanian et al. and APA teach that the lateral extent of the first surface region is equal to a lateral extent of the impurity implantation region and that the impurity implantation region and the first sector have the same lateral extent, because the impurity implantation region comprises the first surface region and the first sector.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2811

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(703) 308-8138**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas, can be reached at **(703) 308-2772**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ori Nadav', is positioned above the printed name and title.

O.N.
October 3, 2003

ORI NADAV
PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800